



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,590	03/31/2001	Anil K. Annadata	M-11404 US	6841

60975 7590 11/14/2006

CSA LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,590

Applicant(s)

ANNADATA ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Remarks filed 9/11/06.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment filed 9/11/06 has been entered. Claims 15-20 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Claims 1-20 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 7, and 15 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sassin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,058,435) in view of Crowther et al. (U.S. Patent 6,771,765).

As to claims 1, 7, and 15, Sassin et al. teach an apparatus comprising: means for receiving a first request in a first media format (voice calls) of a plurality of different media formats (col. 3, lines 12-18) via a first communication channel of a plurality of communication channels (Fig. 1, via PSTN 12), wherein each communication channel of the plurality of communication channels has an associated media format of the plurality of different media formats (col. 3, lines 38-51; col. 6, lines 1-65); means for receiving a second request in a second media format of the plurality of different media formats (e-mail) via a second communication channel of the plurality of communication

Art Unit: 2614

channels (Fig. 1, via Internet 23); means for determining the media formats of each agent of the one or more agents can access (col. 3, lines 22-24; col. 4, lines 37-42; col. 11, lines 40-62); and means for assigning in response to determining, the one or more agents to handle the first and second requests based on the media formats of the first and second requests and the media formats that each agent of the one or more agents can access (col. 5, lines 9-12).

Sassin et al. does not teach determining the media formats that the agent is authorized to access.

Crowther et al. teach determining the media formats that the agent is authorized to access (col. 5, lines 50-65 - *where Crowther discussed the agent is authorized to login a computer or a telephone*; col. 3, line 55 through col. 4, line 2 - *where Crowther discussed determining the type of media the agent login to assign the task*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Crowther into the teachings of Sassin for the purposes of authenticate the agent as a valid agent that authorized to access a particular media, as discussed by Crowther (col. 5, lines 52-65); and further to indicate that the agent is logged in and ready to handle calls.

As to claim 2, 8, and 16, Crowther et al. teach means for assigning the one or more agents to handle the first and second requests based on the subject matter of the first and second requests and the skills associated with the one or more agents (col. 3, line 58 through col. 4, line 2).

As to claims 3, 9, and 17, Crowther et al. teach means for queuing the requests until one of the one or more agents is available to accept the requests (col. 7, lines 17-20).

As to claims 4, 10, and 18, Sassin et al. teach means for assigning the requests to the agents based on a set of rules (abstract; col. 3, line 60 through col. 4, line 5; col. 7, lines 30-40).

As to claims 13 and 14, Sassin et al. teach a computer readable storage media and a signal in a carrier medium comprising instructions to implement the method of claim 7 (Fig. 1, information distribution system; Fig. 2, dynamic skill-based router; etc.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sassin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,058,435) in view of Crowther et al. (U.S. Patent 6,771,765) and further in view of Miloslavsky (U.S. Patent 5,915,011).

As to claims 5-6, 11-12, and 19-20 Sassin and Crowther do not teach means for allowing an agent to decline being assigned to the first or second requests, and to route a handle the call (col. 16, line 59 through col. 17, line 49).

Miloslavsky teaches agent reroute the call to the next agent who is more qualified to handle the call (col. 16, line 59 through col. 17, line 49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of allowing an agent to decline or route a request to another agent, as taught by Miloslavsky, in Sassin's and Crowther's systems

thus making the system more efficient by allowing the customer to receive the best service from an agent who has specific skills and knowledge, and is able and ready to provide the needed service.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/11/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are addressed in the above claims rejections.

Applicant argues that the cited portion of Sassin, col. 6, lines 1-65 fails to distinctly and concisely point out the teachings of Sassin that make obvious the limitations in question; and requested Examiner to indicate with greater particularity that teaches limitation "...each communication channel of the plurality of communication channels has an associated media format of the plurality of different media formats ...". It is respectfully submits that Examiner also cited Fig. 1 prior to citing the latter passage that shows each of communication channel of the plurality of communication channels has an associated media format of the plurality of different media formats. For example, e-mail and computer passes through Internet connections to data gateway 24; voice and facsimile connected to PSTN linked to switch gateway (col. 5, line 1 through col.6, line 65).

Applicant mainly argues that there is no teaching the correlation between a media format and a communication channel; and in Fig. 1 of Sassin, there is nothing indicates that the media involved is different between PSTN 12 and Internet 23. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sassin teaches (Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 18-19 and lines

Art Unit: 2614

33-36) that agent has telephone and facsimile connected to PSTN linked to switch gateway; and e-mail passes through Internet connections to data gateway 24. Hence, it is clearly that there are two separate / different gateways between PSTN12 and Internet 23.

Applicant mainly argues that the media and communication channels an agent is authorized to access is set prior to the agent's use of the system. Examiner respectfully submits that this is not recite in the claims.

Similarly, Applicant mainly argues that the cited passage in Sassin, col. 3, lines 22-24 fails to teach the claimed invention because the in the claimed invention an agent is authorized for the given communications channels prior to accessing the claimed system. Examiner respectfully submits that this is not recite in the claims.

Applicant argues that Sassin does not teach assigning one or more agent to handle request based on the media formats of the first and second requests and the media formats that each agent of the one or more agents can access. Examiner respectfully submits that Sassin does teach the above claimed limitation in different places through out the cited patent. For example, col. 1, line 54 through col. 2, line 6; col. 10, line 20 through col. 11, line 39.

Applicant argues that Crowther fails to teach determining the media formats that the agent is authorized to access. Examiner respectfully that Crowther teaches authenticate the agent as a valid agent that authorized to access a particular media (col. 5, lines 52-65); and further to indicate that the agent is logged on to an authorized media and ready to handle calls (col. 6, lines 2-21).

Applicant argues that there is no showing of a motivation to combine Sassin with Crowther. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Both references are in Telephonic Communications class 379 and dealing multimedia communications in call center. Examiner used the feature of determining the media formats that the agent is authorized to access taught by Crowther to modify Sassin's system to incorporate the feature for authenticating the agent as a valid agent that authorized to access a particular media. Similarly, the same response would apply to the Miloslavsky's reference.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-


Art Unit: 2614

7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan, can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

qhn



Quynh H. Nguyen

November 13, 2006